

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS**

ISAAC BOSTON, Inmate #N73508,)
)
Plaintiff,)
)
vs.) CIVIL NO. 04-628-JLF
)
JASON C. GARNETT and MS.)
PULLEY,)
)
Defendants.

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

FOREMAN, District Judge:

This action is before the Court to rule on Plaintiff's motion to reconsider (Doc. 18). Technically, a "Motion to Reconsider" does not exist under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The Seventh Circuit has held, however, that a motion challenging the merits of a district court order will automatically be considered as having been filed pursuant to Rule 59(e) or Rule 60(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. *See, e.g., Mares v. Busby*, 34 F.3d 533, 535 (7th Cir. 1994); *United States v. Deutsch*, 981 F.2d 299, 300 (7th Cir. 1992). As noted in *Deutsch*, "in cases where it is unclear whether a motion challenging a judgment on the merits is made under Rule 59(e) or Rule 60(b)," the date of service will determine how the motion will be treated. Thus, "'if the motion is served within ten days of the rendition of judgment, the motion falls under Rule 59(e); if it is served after that time, it falls under Rule 60(b).'" *Id. (citations omitted)*.

Judgment was entered in this action on May 24, 2005, and the instant motion was filed on June 2, 2005, within the 10-day period. *See FED.R.CIV.P. 59(e)*. Therefore, under *Deutsch*, the Court will construe the motion as a motion to alter or amend judgment, filed pursuant to Rule 59(e),

which may only be granted if a movant shows there was mistake of law or fact or presents newly discovered evidence that could not have been discovered previously. *Matter of Prince*, 85 F.3d 314 (7th Cir. 1996), *reh'g and suggestion for reh'g en banc denied, cert. denied* 117 S.Ct. 608; *Deutsch v. Burlington Northern R. Co.*, 983 F.2d 741 (7th Cir. 1993).

Upon review of the record, the Court remains persuaded that its ruling dismissing the case pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A was correct. Plaintiff does not argue that there was a mistake of law, nor does he present newly discovered evidence, he merely disagrees with the Court's determination that his factual allegations did not describe constitutional violations. Therefore, the instant motion is **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: June 10, 2005.

s/ James L. Foreman
DISTRICT JUDGE